

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
MARSHALL DIVISION

HEADWATER RESEARCH LLC,

Plaintiff,

v.

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS INC.,
CELLCO PARTNERSHIP d/b/a VERIZON
WIRELESS, and VERIZON CORPORATE
SERVICES GROUP, INC.,

Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

Case No. 2:23-cv-00352-JRG-RSP


ORDER

Defendants Verizon Communications Inc., Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless, and Verizon Corporate Services Group, Inc. previously filed a Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,198,042 (Dkt. No. 181.) Magistrate Judge Payne entered a Report and Recommendation (Dkt. No. 303), recommending that the Court grant Verizon's Motion. Headwater has now filed Objections¹ (Dkt. No. 332) and Verizon has filed its Response (Dkt. No. 365).

After conducting a *de novo* review of the briefing on the Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,198,042, the Report and Recommendation, and the briefing on Headwater's Objections, the Court agrees with the reasoning provided within the Report and Recommendation and concludes that the Objections fail to show that the Report and Recommendation was clearly erroneous. Consequently, the Court **OVERRULES** Headwater's Objections, **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation, and **ORDERS** that the Motion for Summary Judgment of Non-Infringement of U.S. Patent No. 9,198,042 (Dkt. No. 181) is **GRANTED**.

¹ The Court also notes that Plaintiff did not file its objections to the Report and Recommendation in ECF under the event "*Objection to Report and Recommendation [cv, respoth]*," as was required (Dkt. No. 303 at 6) (emphasis added).

So ORDERED and SIGNED this 9th day of July, 2025.



RODNEY GILSTRAP
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE